



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



**Meeting Date:** October 14, 2009 @ 6:00 pm EST

**Subject:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting/Workshop #4

**Attendees:** Attached Sign-In Sheet

**Author:** Tricia Fantinato

These meeting minutes provide a summary of the information and comments provided during the Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Please note that Mr. Philip Jufko, Director of Planning, The LPA Group Incorporated acted as moderator during this process. Comments or questions provided by him to stir discussion are designated as "Moderator Question or Comment". Questions from TAC Members will be designated as such. Comments and opinions from TAC members are denoted as "Commentator stated". Any questions, opinions or comments from the Public are also designated as such. This meeting was held in a workshop type of environment to encourage discussion amongst the TAC Members as well as members of the public. We have attempted to capture this dialogue in these meeting minutes. Note: The TAC meeting was taped, and can be made available upon request.

Copies of the meeting presentation and agenda are provided on the project website ([www.stlucieco.org/airport](http://www.stlucieco.org/airport)). SHOULD YOU DISAGREE WITH THE INFORMATION IN THIS RECORD, PLEASE ADVISE IMMEDIATELY ([TFantinato@lpagroup.com](mailto:TFantinato@lpagroup.com)). Thank you.

## I. Airport Tour

Prior to the Technical Advisory Meeting, 05:00 pm EST, airport management organized a tour of the airport facilities to familiarize members with existing airport facilities and available land/leaseholds for development.

## II. Introduction

Following the tour, members of the TAC joined airport tenants and some members of the general public in the Airport Administration Building to evaluate airport requirements and determine the long-range direction of airport development. Ms. Diana Lewis (D. Lewis), AAE, Airport Director, welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for participating in the Master Plan process. She also reminded the TAC members that they are still bound by Sunshine Rules and that their active participation in this process is encouraged especially during the next few meetings.

D. Lewis also conveyed the Board of County Commissioners policy that members of the TAC, especially those nominated to represent the five commissioners, who miss more than two (2) meetings, may be replaced. The Board is very interested in the recommendations of the TAC in this process so participation is important.

Members of the public are also encouraged to provide written comments either at the meeting via comment cards or through the project website.



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



D. Lewis than introduced Todd Cox, Airport Manager, and members of the master plan team, and turned over the meeting to Mr. Robert Greene, Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee to call the meeting to order.

### III. Technical Advisory Committee Workshop

Mr. Robert Greene was elected during the previous TAC Meeting (June 30, 2009) as the chairperson of the TAC committee. Mr. Greene called the meeting to order, and then turned it back over to the presentation team for confirmation of the June 30<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes and a project status report.

No comments were received and the meeting minutes were approved. Mr. Philip Jufko (Moderator) explained the purpose of the meeting. He emphasized that the alternatives to be presented were based upon TAC input received from the June 30<sup>th</sup> Workshop. In order to move forward, it is necessary to determine, during this meeting, the long-term role of St. Lucie County Airport as well as the type of development necessary to accommodate that role.

**Moderator Comments:** the Alternatives Chapter will include the recommendations and comments received during the TAC and Public Meetings. This information is to be presented to the Board of County Commissioners at a Board Meeting. Upon the BOCC's approval, Chapter 5 will be finalized.

**Moderator Comment:** At the request of the BOCC, LPA had individual meetings with each of the Board members. They were all very interested in the process and want to make sure that their representatives are participating because they are looking to the TAC to provide input to them with regard to the alternatives as well as provide a recommendation for future aviation development. Today, at the request of the BOCC, LPA presented an abbreviated version of master plan development to the St. Lucie County Tourism Development Council. The purpose of which was to demonstrate how the master plan can relate to tourism in St. Lucie County.

### III. Airport Roles

**Moderator Comment:** In order to accurately determine airport requirements for the twenty year planning period, a consensus must be obtained from the TAC on the long-term airport role.

Currently the airport serves general aviation operations only, which include flight training, corporate traffic, emergency services, fractional ownership, and on-demand air taxi/air charter operations. However, at the request of the BOCC and based upon interest by the Bahamas Tourism Board, generalized facility and operational requirements needed for FPR to support commercial service was requested.

**Moderator Comment:** Based upon this request, alternative scenarios were developed based upon the following three (3) roles:

- **General Aviation:**
  - Airport's current role
  - What needs to be addressed in the next five to 10 year period
- **Limited Commercial Service:**



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



- Potential Bahamasair opportunity
- What are the opportunities to bring limited commercial service to FPR
- How quickly can FPR implement the requirements needed to support such a commuter type service (i.e. Part 139 Certification)
- **Air Carrier Commercial Service**
  - Anticipate to occur well beyond 20-year planning period
  - Primarily evaluated to determine highest and best land use and coordinate development with countywide long-range planning.

**Moderator Questions:** Does the TAC still support GA and some limited commercial development if demand warranted at FPR? Also does the TAC still want show the reservation of on-airport property to support expanded service beyond the 20-year planning period?

**Moderator Questions:** Are there any other roles that need to be considered? Is the planning team going in the right direction by evaluating the potential for limited commercial service within the twenty-year planning period?

**Moderator Comment:** A commercial forecast was not developed as part of this master plan, so at this time there is no justification for commercial development merely potential.

**TAC Question:** Why wasn't a commercial forecast developed?

**Team Answer:** At this time, there is no historical or existing demand for such service at FPR. Therefore an accurate forecast of commercial demand cannot be determined at this time. However, the potential for commercial service was considered to determine highest and best land use of airport property.

**TAC Question:** To what extent do projections play into these roles?

**Team Answer:**

- Available projections drive some of the requirements and impact the size and type of facilities required.
- However, for commercial service, the aircraft, FAA Part 139, US Customs and TSA requirements are driving the recommended improvements outlined in two of the alternative development scenarios (Alternatives 2A, 2B and 3).
- For Alternative 3, Air Carrier Service, recommendations were based upon similarly sized airports that support air carrier (legacy) commercial service as well as the type of aircraft, FAA and TSA regulations. Recommendations and requirements denoted for this alternative were merely used to obtain a land use envelope in an effort to reserve property for the potential of future commercial development.

**One Commentator stated** 'When it comes to projections, a lack of facility does not preclude future development. We do this on roadway development all the time.'

**Team Comment:** In this case, accurate projections could not be developed. Therefore, typical corporate and commercial aircraft were used as a benchmark for development. However,



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



projections drive the justification and project funding. Commercial development can be shown but is not likely justifiable in the near term (next 5 years).

**Moderator Request/Verification:** Does the TAC want this master plan to address the immediate airport needs associated with its role as a general aviation airport? Does the TAC also want the master plan to identify minimum requirements needed to accommodate commercial service if warranted?

**At least three commentators stated** 'Even though there is no demonstrated demand at this time, it should still be included so it can be reevaluated in later master plans.'

## IV. Review of TAC Recommendations

A summary of group recommendations provided in the June 30<sup>th</sup> meeting provided the basis for the Alternative Development Options. Some of the issues that required evaluation included:

- Impacts of Power Lines
- Existing and Future Aircraft Fleet Mix and Airfield Requirements
- Evaluate runway extension options (east and west)
- Extension of Runway 14-32
- US Customs and Passenger Terminal Requirements
- Surface transportation network, multimodal facilities, aviation and industrial development, etc.

**One Commentator Requested** 'Please evaluate as part of the master plan update how FPR can become an official US Customs Port of Entry airport so that the hours of operation can be extended from the current schedule of 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM. US Customs' limited hours of operations impacts our businesses (Volo Aviation and Key Air Aviation) because it makes the airport less attractive to potential users. If the airport became an official Port of Entry, it would likely (in my opinion) expand services provided and hours of operations and support new business development.'

**Team Response:** FPR is currently a landing rights airport, and US Customs also serves the Port of Ft. Pierce. According to Customs, the hours were cut because there wasn't sufficient demand at certain times of the day to warrant the staff. If demand increases, US Customs will reevaluate their operations at FPR. However, the Team will determine what may be required for FPR to become an official Port of Entry.

## V. Facility Requirements

- **Extension of Runway 14-32:** The Team presented two options for the extension of Runway 14-32: extend to 5,500 feet or 5,700 feet. The TAC, during the June 30<sup>th</sup> Workshop, agreed that the longer option allowed for aircraft to remain outside the Object Free Area of Runway 10R-28L. An extension of Runway 14-32 has been included in the last two previous master plan updates. Although it may not be considered a high priority, an extension is still warranted.

**Moderator Question/Verification:** Do you the members of the TAC still agree with the longer extension of Runway 14-32?



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



Although not put to a vote, the TAC members attending either provided a verbal or physical response (nod of the head) that they agreed with the extension of Runway 14-32. Note: support of this option is also shown in the June 30<sup>th</sup> published and approved meeting minutes.

- **Pavement Strength:** Pavement strength requirements were also identified as part of the facility requirements. Demand at this time does not support a strengthening of Runway 10R-28L, but it may be warranted in the future (next 6 to 10 years). However, an environmental assessment must be conducted prior to preliminary design.
- **NextGen Opportunities:** Dr. Dave Byers (**D. Byers**) presented how NextGen can improve airspace, airport and aircraft operations by:
  - Providing a virtual tower to assist pilots when landing at an airport when the tower is closed during poor weather.
  - Can be used in support of voluntary noise abatement procedures by clarifying requirements and thereby limiting the aircraft “scatter pattern”.
  - Improve airspace efficiency allowing aircraft to fly direct routes rather than point to point and utilize controlled descent procedures rather than step-down descent procedures. This will improve not only noise but air quality.
  - Decrease runway incursions and provide ATC greater visibility of airfield “hot spots”.
  - Allows aircraft and ground vehicles to be monitored even in low visibility conditions.
  - Could decrease the area needed to support approach and departure procedures thereby freeing up real estate for revenue use.
  - Corporate and commercial aircraft are currently being equipped with this technology, and this technology is being implemented at a number of commercial airports. The south Florida region is also one of the first areas to be equipped with the ground based system (antennas are located at Hobe Sound and Sebastian Airport). The region is being used as test bed for future quantifiable development.

**TAC Question:** How accurate is vertical GPS?

**Team Response:** The GPS is accurate enough for Air Traffic Control.

**One Commentator Stated:** ‘It looks like NextGen can be used for voluntary noise restrictions.’

**Team Response:** Yes, FAA is working on this now by allowing controlled descent rather than a step down descent which drastically decreases noise on approach. Further, GPS limits the “scatter” pattern typically caused by pilot interpretation of noise abatement procedures, therefore decreasing noise impacts to residential areas adjacent to an airport. Aircraft follow the “yellow brick road” in the sky.

**TAC Question:** Is this something that can be incorporated into the master plan update?

**Team Response:** Yes, a recommendation can be added to the master plan that as new technology becomes available that operating procedures be implemented to support future development.

**TAC Question:** As the technology becomes more widely available, would the FAA limit funding available to airports not equipped with these facilities?



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



**Team Response:** It is unlikely that FAA will limit funding. However, it is suggested that on the local level that the airport embrace this technology and incorporate procedures to improve operations at the airport while limiting impacts to noise sensitive areas.

**TAC Question:** What type of equipment is needed in support of this technology?

**Team Response:** No additional equipment is required. To implement, procedures should be coordinated with local policies and the FAA to develop operational procedures to address the airport and community's needs.

**TAC Recommendations:**

- Look at NextGen to address noise;
- Want St. Lucie to take the lead with regard to NextGen:
  - Implement into local policy, and
  - Current airport procedures

**TAC Question:** Are they eliminating the hub and spoke structure?

**Team Response:** Yes and no. At hub airports, it is anticipated to help. However, the biggest problem is not airspace or operational procedures but lack of gates and limited parking. This has been the biggest cause of delays within the airspace system.

- **Draft Noise Contours:** Preliminary 2008/09 Noise Contours show that when compared to the 2005 Part 150 Forecast and with the construction of the new training runway, the contours remain on airport property. Additional noise contours based upon the TAC's recommended development and forecast fleet mix will be run as part of the refined airport development analysis.

**TAC Question:** Is DNL the same as LdN?

**Team Response:** Yes

**TAC Question:** If commercial service were to start, say with Bahamasair, would that negatively impact St. Lucie Village?

**Team Response:** No, it is anticipated that Bahamasair would use the DH-8 Q300 which is a turboprop aircraft which is designed to operate in populated areas and its operational noise levels are very quiet.

**TAC Question:** What about the aircraft shown in Alternative 2B (CRJ-900)? Would this impact the St. Lucie Village?

**Team Response:** The CRJ-900 used for this alternative is based upon the newest model (CRJ-900ER (NextGen)). Again like the DH-8 Q300, it is a Stage IV aircraft under Federal Aviation Regulations and was designed to be more environmentally friendly than its predecessors (lower noise and particulate



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



emissions). Further both aircraft have a steeper climb gradient allowing for aircraft to reach altitude much quicker thereby decreasing noise impacts to properties adjacent to the airport.

**Two members of the public** stated that 'The new Training Runway (10L-28R) is not improving aircraft noise over St. Lucie Village.'

**One Commentator stated** that 'he had also heard from people in the Village, although he was personally not impacted, that the training runway had not improved aircraft noise'.

**Mr. Bob Greene**, TAC Chairperson, stated that the Training Runway has several drawbacks including lack of connectivity to the main airfield, taxi back procedures and no precision approach path indicator lights.

**D. Lewis** stated that Mr. Jerry Groendyke, FAA Air Traffic Control Manager, should address the use of the new training runway.

**Mr. Groendyke's Response:**

- Runway 10L-28R is being used more than originally anticipated. It is being used for all full stop taxi back and touch and go procedures including those from transient (visiting) aircraft.
- All runways are being used by training aircraft based upon operating conditions. However, when possible, ATC is directing operations to the Training Runway.
- Students however are requesting to use Runway 10R-28L when the ATCT is still open in the evening because of the power lines and the lack of approach lighting.
- Further, instructors request that pilots on their first solo flight use Runway 10R-28L since they are able to watch their students from the apron and because Runway 10R-28L is wider and longer.
- Approximately 80 percent of training traffic is currently routed to Runway 10L-28R, so St. Lucie Village should see a significant decrease in noise impacts associated with training operations.
- He did say he was not aware of what happens after the tower closes.

**Public Question:** Residents of St. Lucie Village saw an increase in traffic on October 14. Why?

**Mr. Groendyke's Response:** Today was a different situation since they had training aircraft using Runway 14-32 because survey work was being done. Mr. Groendyke stated that the new runway provides greater separation of traffic between corporate and training activity, has reduced runway crossings by 50 percent, and reduced over flights of St. Lucie Village.

**D. Lewis** also stated that the airport is tracking evening operations (when the ATC is closed), and has seen that over 80 percent of traffic is using Runway 10L-28R (Training Runway), and this information is available on the airport website.

**TAC Question:** Does the website also have daytime operations?

**D. Lewis Response:** No, we are currently only tracking operations when the air traffic control tower is closed.





# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



## VI. Preliminary Alternatives

As part of the preliminary development, development zones were created to identify priority zones for future on-airport development during and beyond the twenty-year planning period.

**Moderator Comments:** The goal of this meeting is to determine which one of the alternative options or a hybrid of the three options reflects the TAC's vision for long-term development at FPR.

- Some projects are phased throughout the planning process, such as fencing. The storm water master plan update is in process; therefore the recommendations of the Airport Master Plan Update will be incorporated into this document.
- Ultimate development is based upon the airport's role, operational demand and critical aircraft.
- To accommodate commercial service (FAR Part 139), the airport must meet the requirements outlined in FAR Part 139 for the type of service it is supporting (Class I, II, III and IV), TSA 1540/42, Airport Security Requirements, Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Requirements (AC 150/5210-6D) as well as a host of design requirements outlined in various Federal Aviation Advisory Circulars.
- Airport requirements to support commercial service are also dependent upon the Part 121 operator likely to use the airport. Some carriers (typically legacy) have stricter standards as part of the operating certificate than even those outlined in the FAA Advisory Circulars and Regulations. Therefore, sometimes requirements and timing of development not exactly "black and white".
- Thus, alternative development was based upon anticipated level of service and aircraft typically used in support of that service.

**TAC Question:** In evaluating long-term requirements, shouldn't development be based upon a Gulfstream 6 or a DH-9?

**Team Response:** A future fleet mix was done as part of the forecasting and facility requirements efforts. Aircraft can stay within a fleet up to 20 to 30 years with maintenance and modifications. We used the newest and most advanced of each model in an effort to determine facility requirements. However, new technology is coming out all the time. So when there is demand for such facilities, a justification must be done based upon the actual aircraft at that time.

**TAC Question:** (Related to Noise) Since you can't regulate or prevent certain aircraft operating at an airport, can you not provide some incentive in order to attract quieter aircraft?

**Team Response:** Yes, it can be done but it would take a lot to implement. This has been used at some airports through landing fees. However, how do you determine the marginal benefit, and the airport cannot discriminate against other operators.

**One Commentator stated (and was supported by another)** that 'The FBO's do have incentives as part of their marketing plans in an effort to attract newer aircraft. They offer discounts in order to promote development. However, it is difficult (in my opinion) if not impossible to attract these aircraft if the airport itself does not meet design standards required by that aircraft. In order to continue to grow and promote the airport, infrastructure must be in place to accommodate this demand.'





# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



**Team Comment:** This, however, is the “Catch-22” – FAA won’t support certain improvements until you show demonstrated demand (i.e. 500 annual operations in the next five years). However, some aircraft operators won’t use the airport because it doesn’t meet their operating requirements.

**TAC Question:** What is the market area of Charlotte County Airport? How does it compare to St. Lucie County?

**Team Response:** Charlotte County Airport’s market area includes Ft. Myers, Sarasota and South Tampa. The users of Charlotte County Airport are price sensitive and don’t need to get to a specific city rather they are looking to get to a certain region and then they will use other transportation to get to their ultimate destinations. This is why Allegiant has been so successful.

**One Commentator** stated ‘Skybus was at St. Augustine Airport but went out of business.’

**Team Response:** Skybus didn’t go out of business because of lack of demand rather it was associated with the credit crisis and credit card hold backs. Skybus proved that people would fly to a region rather than a specific city if the fares were low enough.

**TAC Question:** What does Allegiant Air Fly?

**Team Response:** Allegiant flies DC9 Aircraft which are typically 90 percent full. However, as part of their model, if they can’t achieve this load factor at an airport, they will pull out as they have recently done at Columbia Metro in South Carolina.

**TAC Question:** What is required to support commercial service at St. Lucie?

**Team Response:** With the exception of the Terminal and TSA requirements, the airport has a lot of the physical facilities necessary to support some level of commercial service. However, some air carriers as part of their operating certificate may have certain physical requirements with regard to where they operate. We won’t know this until you speak to the operator.

**The Moderator** described Alternatives 2A and 2B, Limited Commercial Service, and stated that each alternative is based upon different critical aircraft. Alternative 2A is based upon the requirements of the Gulfstream 550 (General Aviation Critical Aircraft) and DH-8 Q300 (Commercial Critical Aircraft). Alternative 2B is based upon the CRJ-900ER (NextGen).

**The Moderator** presented two draft commercial options based upon a rehabilitation of the existing Airport Administration Building. However, the Architectural Team associated with this development still needed to speak with TSA regarding their commercial requirements.

**D. Lewis** mentioned that the Architectural Team was looking at coordinating development with US Customs and possibly connecting the two buildings.

**The Moderator** stated that one of the biggest differences between Alternative 2A and 2B is that in 2B, the FPL Power Transmission Lines will need to be relocated to allow for lower approach minima. In an effort to provide the airport with the greatest flexibility for future development, it was



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



recommended, when demand warrants, that the power lines be relocated to Seminole Road. Although previous master plans recommended moving these lines west of North King's Highway, it was concluded as part of this master plan that moving the power lines to Seminole Road would never require the airport to have to move them again even in the case of a runway extension.

**TAC Question:** Why does anybody have a problem with moving the power lines? Seems like a "no brainer"?

**D. Lewis Response:** FPL requires the County to pay for the relocation. Just to move the power lines to accommodate the training runway was over \$1.7 million, and they were lucky enough to get some money from the agencies in conjunction with the training runway construction. Also, if the power lines are moved off airport property, the county will need to purchase the land for the right of way in addition to moving the lines.

**Team Comment:** The Master Plan Team has been coordinating with the County's Transportation and Growth Management departments since they have long-range plans out to 50 years. According to Growth Management, with planned TVC development, the existing power lines may not be able to support their development and improvements will need to be made anyway.

**TAC Question:** Can the power lines be buried?

**One Commentator** stated 'No, since these are power transmission lines you would need to insulate using a special gel, etc, etc. It would be extremely cost prohibitive.'

**TAC Question:** Does Alternative 2B lower visibility minimums?

**Team Response:** Yes, with the addition of Medium Intensity Approach Lighting with Runway Alignment Indicator Lights (MALSR) and upgrading the existing runway lighting to High Intensity, the visibility minimum would be reduced to a true Category I instrument landing system (ILS) approach of ½ statute mile. (Note: a MALSR uses lighting which includes sequenced type strobe lighting to direct aircraft to the runway)

**The Moderator** presented Alternative 3, which is based upon the possibility of FPR serving unconstrained air carrier service. Since many of the TAC (but not all) wanted the Team to evaluate preserving land for future aviation development beyond the twenty-year planning period, Alternative 3 was developed. Projects shown that relate to full air carrier service, such as the extension of Runway 10R-28L and 10L-28R although shown, were developed to determine the area required to support such development. These projects will not occur within the twenty-year timeframe since no justification exists. Further, prior to design, a justification, benefit cost analysis, environmental assessment, etc. must be done.

**TAC Question:** Could you extend to the East?

**Team Response:** We evaluated this in the report. Because of the terrain, noise issues and anticipated costs, we determined it was not worthwhile to pursue a runway extension to the east. However, as shown in Alternative 3, it is recommended that land be reserved to support future navigational aids and lighting in support of new technology, such as NextGen.



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



**TAC Question:** How far could you extend to the west without relocating the power lines?

**Team Response:** You cannot extend to the west any further without negatively impacting the approach minimums.

**TAC Question:** What is the difference between Alternatives 2A and 2B?

**Team Response:** The primary difference is the approach visibility on Runway 10R and the associated costs related to relocating the power lines, upgrading lighting, etc. However, from a cost benefit side, there is no justification for this development at this time.

**The Moderator:** The alternatives were developed to provide almost a systematic approach or phasing for development over a 50+ year time period at FPR if demand were to exist to justify such development. Alternative 1 supports the airport's current role as a GA airport, and recommended projects are in support of that role. Alternatives 2A and 2B provide varying levels of commercial service. And far into the future, Alternative 3 shows what may be required, based upon current aircraft fleet and federal requirements, to support full commercial service. It is important to note that aircraft are becoming more efficient, quieter and in some cases requiring less operating runway length than their predecessors. This combined with new technology, including NextGen, may negate the need for some of the improvements shown here. The purpose of Alternative 3 was merely to address the potential future land use needs associated with commercial development, to provide the County greater flexibility for such development while also coordinating with other long-term countywide planning efforts.

**TAC Question:** What is the benefit side of Alternatives 2A and 2B?

**Team Response:** Some operators may prefer to operate under a more controlled environment. However, Bahamasair is operating at airports with 1 mile visibility in the Bahamas and legacy carriers (i.e. Delta) operate at Ft. Lauderdale which has visibility minimums down to only ¼ statute mile. But in support of the potential for commercial service, do you want to at least preserve land to allow for such future development if demand warranted?

**The Moderator** stated that the purpose of the master plan is to identify projects and associated costs so they can be put into the FAA and FDOT funding cycle. The airport may or not obtain funding for some recommended master plan projects since they may rate low based upon funding priorities or there is another more important project at another airport within the region that needs the money more.

Master Plans are also updated every five to ten years, so the purpose of reserving areas for aviation development is so future planners will revisit the issues in subsequent master plans. The reservation of land, as shown in Alternative 3, is not just for a runway extension, it could be related to runway lighting, shifting the runway, approach and departure protection zones, etc.

**TAC Question:** Why is FPL "off the hook" from participating in relocating the power lines if needed? Also, the advantage of identifying such projects even though they may not be needed in the next 10-20 years helps coordinate local planning efforts with airport development.



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



**Team Response:** Right now there is no justification for relocating the power lines; therefore, FPL will not participate in the cost of relocating. Further, it is likely that a cost benefit analysis will be done to see if demand warrants the cost of relocation.

**One commentator** stated 'The (St. Lucie) Village Board will likely be ok with Alternatives 2A and even 2B, but will be set against Alternative 3.'

**A member of the Public** further stated that 'The previous Part 150 Study (not sure if he was referring to 1987, 1994 or 2005 Noise Study) showed that the noise contours went straight down the center of the Village; therefore, it is unlikely that anyone from that community would support the introduction of large commercial aircraft operations as suggested in Alternative 3.'

**Moderator Comment:** During the previous meeting, the majority of the TAC (not all) was in some agreement with preserving land on the airport to accommodate the potential for future development. Is this still true?

**TAC Question:** Can you first explain how you "reserve land"?

**Team Response:** Land reserved for future "aviation development" will be shown as a box. The language used will be very generic and non-committal. The team needs to do this in order to identify areas that can be used for other sources of revenue generation and environmental mitigation. However, the focus of the master plan will be on the short to mid-term, but it is our suggestion that the County not lose out on an opportunity.

**At Least Three (3) Commentators** stated that 'It is important to reserve for the long-term.'

**Two Commentators** also stated that 'It is important to not say that the St. Lucie Community may not support Alternative 3. The county is home to more than 280,000 people who in the future will demand other transportation options.'

**One Commentator** stated 'Still demand must be there in order to justify development.'

**One Commentator** stated 'There is definitely a cost of reserving property for future development. We have Vero Beach, Sebastian, Okeechobee, etc nearby. What are they doing? What is the demand? There is competition for money and if we are taking property off the market, wouldn't that negatively impact the airport?'

**TAC Question:** But how does this compare? Based upon the entire airport property, what is the cost of reserving the portion of the airport property as suggested in Alternative 3? Isn't there a way to preserve but use language that allows for alternative development if warranted?

**Team Response:** Yes, the purpose of Alternative 3 is not to make the property unusable for anything but aviation, but to help the team determine areas for non-aviation development without limiting the long-term potential of FPR.



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



**One member of the Public** asked 'What are the impacts to the community? It is (my opinion) that St. Lucie Village residents will support Alternative 3.'

**One Commentator** stated in response that 'The airport serves the entire county, so you need to consider the entire county as the community not just contiguous properties. I know of many subdivisions located near I-95 and that noise far surpasses anything from the airport. This airport supports the county community not just people contiguous to it.'

**Moderator Comment:** If recommendations don't end up in the plan, they will not be considered. Further, development must still be evaluated based upon financial feasibility.

**One Commentator** stated that 'The last master plan did not address a number of key issues. We need to do the right thing to address development. The primary obligation of this airport is economic growth. The airport needs to reinvent itself since both Vero Beach and Stewart Airports have no desire to grow. Therefore, as part of this master plan update, it would be to our benefit to consider not only the existing issues but to provide recommendations (including the reservation of land) to accommodate potential opportunities.'

In an effort to determine preferred development, The Moderator requested TAC members vote on the alternatives.

**TAC Question:** Do we have to vote for only one alternative?

**Team Response:** No, you can vote for an alternative in its entirety as well as parts of another if you so choose. It was anticipated that the preferred development would consist of a hybrid of the alternatives presented as well as requests from the TAC.

**Moderator Question:** How many approve of using Alternative 2A as the base for development?

**TAC Members:** All TAC members in attendance approved of Alternative 2A as a base.

**Three Commentators stated** 'Use Alternative 2A as the base but preserve for future development as shown in Alternatives 2B and 3.'

**Several (3 or more) Commentators** stated (and all attendees seemed to agree either through a verbal or physical affirmative) that 'in the master plan, the following recommendations should be included: power lines should be moved; use of NextGen encouraged and implementation of policies and operating improvements to support economic development.'

**TAC Question:** Does anyone have any idea how much it will cost to actually move the power lines to Seminole Road?

**Team Response:** At this time no, but we are trying to get some information from FPL. This information will be incorporated into the financial feasibility section of the report if that is the wish of the Committee.



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



**One Commentator** stated 'Agree with Alternative 2A being used as a base for development with areas reserved to accommodate development shown in Alternatives 2B and 3. The previous Master Plan did not cover a lot of stuff, so we should consider the potential for such development in the future.'

**One Commentator** stated 'The Airport should try to be all things to everyone.'

**One member of the Public** stated 'However, Alternative 3 is offensive to anyone living near the airport. When the 1983 master plan suggested that FPR would support commercial service, land owners used it to falsely boost the price of property.'

**Moderator Question:** Do you have an issue with just preserving land for potential long-term (50+ year) development?

**One Commentator** stated 'Do what is necessary to make the airport safe and encourage economic development, but stay away from Alternative 3. Don't have an issue with preserving, but don't want to see something like what is shown in Alternative 3 to happen in the next 10 years. Just because it is on the master plan, don't want to see things speed up. Want to make sure that there is justification for such development. Also want to see something encouraging noise abatement.'

**One member of the Public** stated 'I (Mayor Thiess) will take this information back to the Board of St. Lucie Village but think they will oppose Alternative 3 unless aircraft operations totally change. The Village has been here since 1885 and unlikely to move, but I do not object to either Alternative 2A or 2B with some reservation of land for future development.'

**One Commentator** stated 'For Alternatives 2A, 2B and preservation of 3 – You have to give County and Airport Administration flexibility in dealing with potential opportunities.'

**One Commentator** stated 'Agree with safety and operational upgrades needed to preserve airport. Also, agree with using very nebulous (vague) wording to identify on-airport land preserved for future development that is not as yet justified.'

**One Commentator** stated 'Don't want to take away the option of preserving for future development. Don't want to give away the land and therefore limit options - better to add a justification codicil associated with proposed development.'

**Moderator Comment:** The comments and recommendations of this committee as well as the general public will be presented to the Board of County Commissioners for their input and approval before the Alternatives Chapter, airport layout plan and financial analysis can be completed.

**TAC Question:** Could Runway 14-32 be used as the primary runway? Can this runway be extended to 8,000 feet?

**Team Response:** No, extending this runway beyond a total length of 5,700 feet would cause several safety and capacity problems by limiting the use of both Runways 10R-28L and 10L-28R. Also, it does not provide 95 percent wind coverage. In addition, Runway 14-32 has pavement strength of only 15,000 lbs single wheel. To support potential long-term commercial service as outlined in Alternative



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



3, the runway would need to be widened and extended, pavement strengthened, lighting changed and added, markings changed, etc. Much more costly than Runway 10R-28L even, we believe, with the power line issue.

**TAC Question:** Before we prioritize the power line issue, can there be a study?

**Team Response:** A benefit cost analysis will likely be required to determine if moving the power lines would be the best course of action.

**One Commentator** stated 'Even though it is costly to move the power lines, we should keep this in the master plan along with the recommended right of way west of Seminole Road so development can be coordinated with the County's long-term plans.'

**One Commentator** stated 'However, the power lines are not just an airport issue and should be coordinated with land use planning.'

**TAC Question:** How much land is associated with the airport?

**D. Lewis:** Approximately 3,672 acres

**TAC Question:** How much on-airport land is under conservation easement?

**D. Lewis:** Approximately 120 acres are under conservation easement with another 200-250 acres set aside.

**TAC Question:** Is there any way to determine the operating requirements of the airlines?

**Team Response:** We would need to contact each airline.

**Moderator Comment:** In Alternative 2A, the airport can accommodate the majority of general aviation, corporate and Part 135 operations as well as small commercial/commuter service.

**One Commentator** stated 'However, you can't just consider Bahamasair.'

**Team Response:** True, there are other commercial operators that most likely can operate at FPR once it becomes certified. Again, since a commercial operator has not as of yet provided a letter of interest, we have to make an educated guess based upon other airports that support commercial operations in the region.

## **TAC Recommendations:**

- All attending TAC Members supported development outlined in Alternative 2A
- 10 of the 12 attending TAC members voted to preserve land for future development as shown in Alternatives 2B and 3. However, demonstrated demand must be shown prior to approval of development. Also, language must be added to consider other development if aviation demand is not warranted. The TAC also wants to make sure that these options are re-evaluated in subsequent plans.





# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



- Do not allow accelerated development – just because development is on the plan doesn't mean it has to be done unless justified.

## VII. Additional Questions and Comments

This section provides a summary of additional questions and comments provided during TAC Meeting #4. Meeting minutes and written comments will be incorporated into Appendix B, Key Members and Public Participation, of the Master Plan Update report.

**Public Question:** Does the airport have to be an official US Customs Port of Entry to have commercial service?

**Team Response:** No. Bahamasair and other carriers can operate here without FPR being an official Port of Entry since the airport is a Landing Rights Field.

**One Commentator** stated 'However, not being a Port of Entry does make the airport less desirable to some users because of the limited operating hours of US Customs.'

**D. Lewis:** US Customs because of budget cuts and lack of demand is trying to maximize the use of their existing staff rather than adding staff - until there is a definitive need, will be unlikely to expand hours.

**One Commentator** stated 'However, can't show demand if the US Custom's is not open. The airport used to be a twelve hour field until they cut funding and staffing.'

**Public Questions:** What has to be done to bring commercial traffic in? What is the timeframe that you envision that those could be completed?

**One Commentator** stated 'This may be difficult for the Planning Team to determine since there are a number of variables.'

**Public Response:** These people have a lot of experience and they should be able to say from their expertise that from this list (of requirements) what needs to be required. Some may be negotiable but they (LPA) should be able to say, "Here is what is required in the regulations and here is what we are able to negotiate."

**Moderator Comment:** Some of this information we could characterize using the Bahamas Air scenario. Given this example, we could come up with a list of projects.

**Public Comment:** You should be able to come up with a list of projects and costs using ball park estimates.

**Public Comment:** You are not doing a feasibility analysis as part of this master plan?

**Team Response:** No, we always do a financial feasibility analysis as part of a master plan. Once the preferred alternative development is determined, the team can start on the cost estimates, phasing and financial analysis. This is usually the last chapter in the report.



# Technical Advisory Meeting Master Plan Update St. Lucie County International Airport Meeting Minutes



## VIII. Summary and Next Steps

**T. Fantinato** requested if the TAC would please provide comments on Chapter 4, Demand Capacity and Facility Requirements by November 6, 2009.

**T. Fantinato** stated that the team is incorporating Staff Comments on Chapter 5, Airport Alternative Analysis. Once we receive approval of the changes, we will provide to the TAC for their review. We will provide at least three weeks for review of the chapter because of the size and amount of information.

**D. Lewis** also stated that we will be presenting this information to the Board of County Commissioners at an informal workshop. As of today, the date for that meeting has not been set.

**The Moderator** also invited members of the TAC to attend the public workshop at the Fenn Center Tomorrow, October 15, starting and 5:30 pm EST

**October 14th Meeting adjourned at 9:50 pm EST.**